

To: Joint Steering Committee for Development of RDA  
From: Susanne Oehlschläger, DNB Representative  
Subject: Major and minor title changes for serials in languages which do not divide text into words: proposal for new wordings and instructions

DNB thanks the ISSN International Centre and the ISSN Review Group for this discussion paper. We asked experts for Asian languages for their assessment. Here are their comments:

1) Assuming that the rule under 2.3.1.1.a) („first five words rule“) is important, we have the following questions:

- a) Why shouldn't the instruction be applied for Chinese and Japanese as well? Both languages include rules on how to divide text into words, even if these rules are not reflected in the caption of the original script. For Chinese these rules are included in the rules regarding the Hanyu Pinyin transcription (“Hanyu Pinyin Fang'an“, German “Programm zur Fixierung der Laute im Chinesischen“). For Japanese they are realized by inserting blanks between the words when cataloguing the original script in NACSIS.
- b) Why aren't other languages, e.g. Korean, affected by this exception as well, if it is justified?
- c) Why do you want to differentiate between the original script and its transcription? If the reason is, that you are dividing text into words when you make a transcription (please note, that Germany decided against dividing text into words when cataloguing Chinese media), it is not clear why not doing so with original scripts as well. As we understand it, to differentiate would also imply that institutions which catalogue the original script would split titles in a different way than institutions that do not catalogue the original script.

2) Regarding the proposed text for 2.3 “Changes in continuing resources requiring a new ISSN assignment“ we have the following comments:

a) Page 3/5, „2.3.1.2 For languages and scripts that do not divide text into words“:  
We would prefer a definition allowing to assess which languages fall under this category. Otherwise a full list of all relevant languages should be included.

b) Regarding the bullet point (“An addition, deletion,...“) under 2.3.1.2:  
It looks like that for languages and scripts that do not divide text into words, the rules under 2.3.1.1 a) – b) should be replaced by the suggested bullet point and that c) is deleted without replacement. We don't think that this is what is intended. Therefore, we suggest the following:

2.3.1.2 For languages and scripts that do not divide text into words

- a) An addition, deletion, change or reordering of any component of the title proper that changes the meaning of the title or indicates a different subject matter.  
[Example to be provided]
- b) When a corporate body, named anywhere in the title proper, changes, except as indicated below (see 2.4.1).

c) Page 5/5, example under 2.4.1 k):

The titles 研究実施概況報告集 and 研修実施概況報告書 are given as examples intended to show the change of the title from 集 (collection) to 書 (book; as a component of 報告書 „report“) in the last character. However at the same time, the second character of the term 研究 (research) within the title changes to 研修 (training). We assume that this is a typo; otherwise this would be an example for a “major change” and would be inappropriate.

3) The document uses the term "transliteration" throughout. However, "transliteration" means a letter by letter conversion from one script to another and would be reversible again letter by letter. The proper term should be "transcription" which tries to represent the sound of the original language regardless of its original script. Chinese and Japanese characters (Hanzi/Kanji) cannot be transliterated letter by letter, only their sound can be represented in Roman alphabet. Also, since "transcription" is the wider term it would also include "transliteration".